UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE                                  | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/574,230       | 08/31/2006                                   | Ulrike Schulz        | P29300              | 2143             |
|                  | 7590 03/27/200<br>& BERNSTEIN, P.L. <b>.</b> |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| 1950 ROLAND      | CLARKE PLACE                                 |                      | DODSON, SHELLEY A   |                  |
| RESTON, VA 20191 |  |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                  |  |                      | 1616                |                  |
|                  |  |                      |                     |                  |
|                  |  |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE   | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                  |  |                      | 03/27/2008          | ELECTRONIC       |

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Symptoms   | 10/574,230  | SCHULZ ET AL. |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit      |  |  |  |
|  | SHELLEY A. DODSON   | 1616          |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address<br>Period for Reply  |   |               |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |               |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |               |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |   |               |  |  |  |
|  | -·<br>action is non-final.  |               |  |  |  |
| ,  | ,   |               |  |  |  |
|  | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. |               |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Lx parte Quayre, 1935 C.D. 11, 405 C.C. 215.  |   |               |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |               |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 16-45 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 16-45 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>   |   |               |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |   |               |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   |   |               |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.   |   |               |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |   |               |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |   |               |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |   |               |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |               |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>  |   |               |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/30/06.  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:  |   |               |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 1616

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 16-45 are pending in this application filed August 31, 2006.

Applicant's claims are directed toward transparent cosmetic microemulsion-based formulation containing an alpha-hydroxy-carboxylic acid.

### **Double Patenting**

1.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/574,230

Page 3

Art Unit: 1616

2.

Claims 16-45 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-45 of copending Application No. 10/574,219. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the instant application as well as the referenced application is claiming cosmetic formulations comprising at least one antiperspirant active ingredient which is an activated aluminum chlorohydrate compound, at least one alpha hydroxycarboxylic acid which further comprises mandelic acid and water. Both the instant application as well as the referenced application is based on a microemulsion. No patentable distinction can be found between the two applications.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

3.

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on November 30, 2006 is noted and the submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97.

Accordingly, the examiner has considered the information disclosure statement.

## Telephone Inquiries

4.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHELLEY A. DODSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-0612. The examiner can normally be reached from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter, can be reached at 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/SHELLEY A. DODSON/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1616